REMARKS

The Examiner's comments from the Office Action mailed February 28, 2007 have been carefully considered. Claims 1-42 remain pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 23, 29, 30, and 35 are amended. Editorial revisions also are made to FIG. 1. Support for these revisions can be found throughout the specification and figures.

Reexamination and allowance of claims 1-42 is respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants note the Form 1449 filed November 28, 2005 has not been initialed by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request the references cited on the submitted Form 1449 be considered and an initialed copy of the Form 1449 be returned to Applicant in accordance with MPEP §609.

Objection to the Oath/Declaration

Formal objection is made to the declaration for omitting the city and state of residence of the second inventor. To correct the omission, an application data sheet providing the omitted information is being submitted herewith. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings

Formal objection is made to the figures for omitting reference numbers 100 and 102. A replacement sheet including FIG. 1 is filed herewith. FIG. 1 is amended to add omitted reference number 100. FIG. 1 is also amended to remove a decimal point from reference number 102. No new matter is added. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments.

Formal objections are also made to FIG. 2 for omitting the legend "Prior Art." Applicants respectfully disagree with this objection. FIG. 2 illustrates a computer system that may represent one of the nodes shown in FIG. 1 and which receives and disseminates information and publishes and shares documents in accordance with the present invention. See

page 11, lines 8-10 of the present application. Thus, FIG. 2 does not necessarily illustrate only a prior art system. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the objection.

Claim Objections

Formal objection is made to claim 3 for a typographical error. Appropriate correction is made. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 35-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Office Action objects to the term "medium" in the preamble of claim 35. To overcome the rejection, the preamble of claim 35 is amended to recite a computer program data product readable by a computing system. Applicants assert claim 35 is directed to statutory subject matter.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 35-42 is respectfully requested.

Lui et al.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10, 23, 25, 30, 32, 35, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lui et al. ("Interoperability of Peer-to-Peer File Sharing Protocols," August 2002) (hereinafter, "Lui"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, intercepting at a second computer system a request from a user of the second computer system. The request includes a user-friendly handle identifying a principal of the first computer system. Claim 1 also recites replacing at the second computer system the user-friendly handle with a machine location of the first computer system.

The application defines the term "principal" as "any entity capable of acting digitally." See page 8, lines 18-20 of the application. Examples of user-friendly handles can include email addresses, telephone numbers, mobile phone numbers, etc. See page 13, lines 15-17. The machine location provides a unique address for the principal's computer system. Examples of

machine locations include an IP address and a public key. See page 14, lines 1-2. The second computer system replaces the user-friendly handle identifying the *principal* of the first computer system with a machine location, which identifies the *first computer system*.

In contrast, Lui fails to disclose or suggest replacing at a second computer system a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location in a request from a user of the second computer system. In fact, Lui does not even disclose or suggest replacing a user-friendly handle with a machine location.

Rather, Lui discloses how some existing peer-to-peer ("P2P") systems are implemented and proposes a new P2P gateway system. The gateway does not intercept requests from users of the gateway and replace user-friendly handles in the request with machine locations. Rather, the gateway merely translates messages among the different protocols. See *Lui*, page 32 and Figure 6. For example, Lui states:

> The P2P gateway performs the conversion, for instance converting the "Handshake Request" message of Freenet to the "Ping" message of Gnutella and the "Login" message of Napster

Id.

Furthermore, the disclosure in Lui of the existing P2P systems does not disclose or teach intercepting at a computer system requests from a user of the computer system and replacing a user-friendly handle in the request with machine location at the computer system. In fact, no motivation is provided in Lui to replace a user-friendly handle with a machine location. Lui is silent regarding whether user-friendly handles are even used in any of the P2P systems.

For at least these reasons, Lui does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-6 is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 recites, in part, resolving at the accessing node the user-friendly handle identifying a principal with the machine location in a request for access to documents from a user of the accessing node. The request is made from the accessing node to the publishing node.

Lui does not disclose or suggest resolving at an accessing node a user-friendly handle with a machine location in a request for access to documents made from the accessing node. Rather, Lui is directed to a new P2P system in which a gateway enables communication across different P2P systems by providing protocol conversion services. These conversion services do not include converting a user-friendly handle to a machine location. In fact, no motivation is provided in Lui to replace a user-friendly handle and a machine location.

For at least these reasons, Lui does not anticipate claim 7. Claims 8-22 depend from claim 7 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 7-22 is respectfully requested.

Claim 23 recites, in part, intercepting a request for access to documents from a user of a second computer system; and amending the request at the second computer system to replace a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with the machine location.

In contrast, Lui does not disclose or suggest amending at a second computer system a request from a user of the second computer system to replace a user-friendly handle with a machine location. In fact, no motivation is provided in Lui to replace a user-friendly handle and a machine location.

For at least these reasons, Lui does not anticipate claim 23. Claims 24-29 depend from claim 23 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 23-29 is respectfully requested.

Claim 30 recites, in part, a communication module and a name resolution module. The communication module receives requests from a user for access to documents. The name resolution module intercepts the requests for access to documents stored on the second computer system and amends each request to replace a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location.

Lui does not disclose or suggest a computer system having both a communication module for receiving requests from users for access to documents and a name resolution module for

15

amending each of the requests to replace a user-friendly handle with a machine location. In fact, no motivation is provided in Lui to replace a user-friendly handle and a machine location.

For at least these reasons, Lui does not anticipate claim 30. Claims 31-34 depend from claim 30 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 30-34 is respectfully requested.

Claim 35 recites, in part, receiving instructions from a user of an accessing computer system to generate a request for access to documents stored on a publishing computer system; and amending the request at the accessing computer system to replace a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location.

Lui fails to disclose or suggest amending at the accessing computer system a request from a user of the accessing computer system to replace a user-friendly handle with a machine location. In fact, no motivation is provided in Lui to replace a user-friendly handle and a machine location.

For at least these reasons, Lui does not anticipate claim 35. Claims 36-42 depend from claim 35 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 35-42 is respectfully requested.

Boyle

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-15, 17, 19-23, 25-30, 32-35, and 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boyle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,847, hereinafter "Boyle"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In contrast to claim 1, Boyle does not disclose or suggest replacing at a second computer system a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location in a request from a user of the second computer system. In fact, Boyle does not even disclose or suggest replacing a user-friendly handle with a machine location.

Rather, Boyle discloses a first computer determining the Internet Protocol (IP) address of a second computer on a computer network through the use of Address Resolution Protocol (ARP) and Reverse Address Resolution Protocol (RARP). *Boyle*, Abstract. ARP enables a first computer to find the hardware address of a second computer on the same network, given the IP

address of the second computer. The IP address of the second computer is not a user-friendly handle as recited in claim 1. The IP address identifies a computer and not the principal of a computer.

No motivation is provided in Boyle to replace at a second computer system a user-friendly handle with a machine location in a request generated by the second computer system. Furthermore, no motivation is provided in Boyle to store at the second computer system a user-friendly handle identifying a principal of the first computer system.

For at least these reasons, Boyle does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-6 is respectfully requested.

In contrast to claim 7, Boyle does not disclose or suggest resolving at an accessing node a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location in a request for access to documents made from the accessing node. Rather, Boyle discloses obtaining an IP address of a computer system using ARP and RARP processes.

For at least these reasons, Boyle does not anticipate claim 7. Claims 8-22 depend from claim 7 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 7-22 is respectfully requested.

In contrast to claim 23, Boyle does not disclose or suggest amending at a second computer system a request from a user of the second computer system to replace a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location. Rather, Boyle discloses obtaining an IP address of a computer system using ARP and RARP processes.

For at least these reasons, Boyle does not anticipate claim 23. Claims 24-29 depend from claim 23 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 23-29 is respectfully requested.

In contrast to claim 30, Boyle does not disclose or suggest a computer system having both a communication module for receiving requests from users for access to documents and a

17

name resolution module for amending each of the requests to replace a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location. Rather, Boyle discloses obtaining an IP address of a computer system using ARP and RARP processes.

For at least these reasons, Boyle does not anticipate claim 30. Claims 31-34 depend from claim 30 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 30-34 is respectfully requested.

In contrast to claim 35, Boyle fails to disclose or suggest amending at the accessing computer system a request from a user of the accessing computer system to replace a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location. Rather, Boyle discloses obtaining an IP address of a computer system using ARP and RARP processes.

For at least these reasons, Boyle does not anticipate claim 35. Claims 36-42 depend from claim 35 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 35-42 is respectfully requested.

Reiche

Claims 1-4, 7-8, 10-11, 16, 23-26, 30-33, and 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Reiche (U.S. Patent No. 6,092,196, hereinafter "Reiche"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In contrast to claim 1, Reiche does not disclose or suggest replacing at a second computer system a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location in a request from a user of the second computer system.

Rather, Reiche is directed to providing an authentication server for remote users to connect securely to customer servers. The remote user requests a connection to a customer server and the customer server constructs a special URL containing a client ID, transaction ID generated by the customer server. *Reiche*, col. 8, line 61 through col. 9, line 3. The customer server redirects the remote user to the authentication server. *Reiche*, col. 9, lines 6-9. The remote user then provides authentication information to the authentication server. *Reiche*, col. 9, lines 20-45.

No motivation is provided in Reiche to replace at the remote computer a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location in a request for access to documents stored on the customer server. Rather, the customer server in Reiche can add information to an URL.

For at least these reasons, Reiche does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-6 is respectfully requested.

In contrast to claim 7, Reiche does not disclose or suggest resolving at an accessing node a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location in a request for access to documents made from the accessing node. Rather, Reiche discloses adding at a customer server information to an URL.

For at least these reasons, Reiche does not anticipate claim 7. Claims 8-22 depend from claim 7 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 7-22 is respectfully requested.

In contrast to claim 23, Reiche does not disclose or suggest amending at a second computer system a request from a user of the second computer system to replace a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location. Rather, Reiche discloses adding at a customer server information to an URL.

For at least these reasons, Reiche does not anticipate claim 23. Claims 24-29 depend from claim 23 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 23-29 is respectfully requested.

In contrast to claim 30, Reiche does not disclose or suggest a computer system having both a communication module for receiving requests from users for access to documents and a name resolution module for amending each of the requests to replace a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location. Rather, Reiche discloses adding at a customer server information to an URL.

For at least these reasons, Reiche does not anticipate claim 30. Claims 31-34 depend from claim 30 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 30-34 is respectfully requested.

In contrast to claim 35, Reiche fails to disclose or suggest amending at the accessing computer system a request from a user of the accessing computer system to replace a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location. Rather, Reiche discloses adding at a customer server information to an URL directing a remote user to a customer server.

For at least these reasons, Reiche does not anticipate claim 35. Claims 36-42 depend from claim 35 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 35-42 is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejections

Claims 2, 8, 16, 24, 31, and 36 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyle, as applied to claims 1, 7, 15, 23, 30, and 35 above, and further view of Huitema et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,065,587, hereinafter "Huitema"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is allowable over Boyle for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Huitema does not overcome the shortcomings of Boyle. Huitema also does not disclose or suggest replacing at a second computer system a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location in a request from a user of the second computer system.

For at least these reasons, Boyle would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 2, even in view of Huitema. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 16 depend from claim 7 and are allowable over Boyle for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 7.

Huitema does not overcome the shortcomings of Boyle. Huitema also does not disclose or suggest resolving at an accessing node a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location in a request for access to documents made from the accessing node.

For at least these reasons, Boyle would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claims 8 and 16, even in view of Huitema. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 8 and 16 is respectfully requested.

Claim 24 depends from claim 23 and is allowable over Boyle for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 23.

Huitema does not overcome the shortcomings of Boyle. Huitema also does not disclose or suggest amending at a second computer system a request from a user of the second computer system to replace a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location.

For at least these reasons, Boyle would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 24, even in view of Huitema. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 24 is respectfully requested.

Claim 31 depends from claim 30 and is allowable over Boyle for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 30.

Huitema does not overcome the shortcomings of Boyle. Huitema also does not disclose or suggest a computer system having both a communication module for receiving requests from users for access to documents and a name resolution module for amending each of the requests to replace a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location.

For at least these reasons, Boyle would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 31, even in view of Huitema. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 31 is respectfully requested.

Claim 36 depends from claim 35 and is allowable over Boyle for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 35.

Huitema does not overcome the shortcomings of Boyle. Huitema also does not disclose or suggest amending at the accessing computer system a request from a user of the accessing computer system to replace a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location.

For at least these reasons, Boyle would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 35, even in view of Huitema. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 35 is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyle, as applied to claims 7 and 17 above, and further view of Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 7,131,001, hereinafter "Johnson"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 9 and 18 depend from claim 7 and are allowable over Boyle for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 7.

Johnson does not overcome the shortcomings of Boyle. Johnson also does not disclose or suggest resolving at an accessing node a user-friendly handle identifying a principal with a machine location in a request for access to documents made from the accessing node.

For at least these reasons, Boyle would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claims 9 and 18, even in view of Johnson. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 9 and 18 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants do not concede the correctness of the above rejections and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary. In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: May 26, 2007   /Robert A. Kalinsky/
                               Robert A. Kalinsky
                               Reg. No. 50,471